

1
2
3 :JEFFREY-MERRITT : WILSON,
4 Plaintiff,
5 v.
6 NBS DEFAULT SERVICES, LLC,
7 Defendant.
8

9 Case No. [16-cv-06253-BLF](#)
10
11

**12 ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
13 CLARIFICATION REGARDING
14 JURISDICTION; REGARDING
15 ADMINISTRATIVE DUTY;
16 REGARDING AFFIDAVITS;
17 REGARDING PUBLIC TRUST**

18 [Re: ECF 26]

19 Presently before the Court is Plaintiff :Jeffrey-Merritt : Wilson's request for clarification
20 regarding jurisdiction; regarding administrative duty; regarding affidavits; regarding public trust
21 with respect to the Court's orders regarding ECF 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 23 (collectively, "requests
22 for judicial notice"). *See Request*, ECF 26. The Court construes this as a motion for clarification
23 of the Court's previous orders denying Plaintiff's requests for judicial notice. Having carefully
24 reviewed this matter, Plaintiff's motion will be denied for the reasons explained below.

25 "A court may clarify its order for any reason." *Wahl v. Am. Sec. Ins. Co.*, No. C 08-0555,
26 2010 WL 2867130, at*3 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2010). This type of request "invite[s] interpretation,
27 which trial courts are often asked to supply, for the guidance of the parties." *Bordallo v. Reyes*,
28 763 F.2d 1098, 1102 (9th Cir. 1985). From this, it is apparent that the clarification process
presumes some legitimate need supporting relief, such as the existence of ambiguity or confusion
that can be corrected with further explanation. But where an order or direction of the court is
clear, it follows that clarification is unnecessary.

29 On December 2, 2016, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff's mandatory judicially
30 noticed evidence. Order, ECF 15 (denying ECF 14). On January 3, 2017, the Court issued an
order denying Plaintiff's request that the Court take judicial notice of the following documents: (1)

1 Default of Claim Administrative Remedy, ECF 17; (2) Default of Claim Administrative Remedy,
2 ECF 18; (3) “Affidavit of Truth” Re: Habeas Corpus, ECF 19; and (4) Appointment of Fiduciary,
3 ECF 20. Order II, ECF 22. On January 6, 2017, the Court issued a third order denying yet
4 another mandatory judicial notice entry on the record of self-authenticated evidence, ECF 23.
5 Order III, ECF 24. Presumably in light of these orders, Plaintiff requests that the Court clarify the
6 following: (1) the jurisdiction of this Court, as it is Plaintiff’s “belief that this is an Article III
7 Court of Record or an Administrative-Law-Tribunal in Admiralty which would be operating with
8 the rule of the Uniform-Commercial-Code”; (2) “[a]dministrative [r]emedy [p]rocedure and
9 [d]uty”; (3) the “dishonor[ing]” of his writ for habeas corpus; and (4) the “dishonor[ing]” of his
10 fiduciary appointment. Request 2–3.

11 Within the framework stated above, however, the Court finds the request misplaced for
12 two reasons. First, nothing in the three aforementioned orders requires clarification, as they are
13 neither confusing, incomplete, nor ambiguous. In the December 2, 2016 order, the Court denied
14 Plaintiff’s request that the Court take judicial notice of “International Commercial Claim
15 Administrative Remedy” because Plaintiff filed the request without an underlying motion and
16 because the document did not appear to be of the type subject to judicial notice. Order. In the
17 January 3, 2017 order, the Court denied Plaintiff’s request that the Court take judicial notice of the
18 documents at ECF 17–20 for the same reasons it denied Plaintiff’s prior request—there was no
19 underlying motion and because the documents did not appear to be of the type subject to judicial
20 notice. Order II, at 1. The Court also denied Plaintiff’s request for judicial notice of appointment
21 of fiduciary, in which he “nominate[d] and [] appoint[ed] Beth Labson Freeman / BETH
22 LABSON FREEMAN, a Judge or successor Judge as being qualified to fulfill the position of the
23 public ‘Fiduciary/Trustee’ for the corporate entity described [] in all-capital-letter assemblages =
24 JEFFREY MERRITT WILSON, TRUST[,]” because he provided no authority for taking this
25 action. Finally, in the January 6, 2017 order, the Court again denied Plaintiff’s request that the
26 Court take judicial notice without an underlying motion. Order III. No further instruction is
27 required.

28 Second, many of the specific clarification questions posed by Plaintiff seeks information

1 that cannot be provided by the Court. Indeed, Plaintiff's request appears to be more in line with a
2 request for legal advice, which the Court cannot give. Plaintiff may wish to contact the Federal
3 Pro Se Program, a free program that offers limited legal services and advice to parties who are
4 representing themselves. The Federal Pro Se Program has offices in two locations, listed below.
5 Help is provided by appointment and on a drop-in basis. Parties may make appointments by
6 calling the program's staff attorney, Mr. Kevin Knestruck, at 408-297-1480. Additional
7 information regarding the Federal Pro Se Program is available at
8 <http://cand.uscourts.gov/helpcentersj>.

9

10 Federal Pro Se Program
11 United States Courthouse
12 280 South 1st Street
13 2nd Floor, Room 2070
14 San Jose, CA 95113
15 Monday to Thursday 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm
16 Fridays by appointment only

17 Federal Pro Se Program
18 The Law Foundation of Silicon Valley
19 152 North 3rd Street
20 3rd Floor
21 San Jose, CA 95112
22 Monday to Thursday 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
23 Fridays by appointment only

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15

16 Dated: January 18, 2017

17 
18 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
19 United States District Judge

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28